

# LUCIFER.

## THE LIGHT-BEARER.

ENTERED AT THE CHICAGO POSTOFFICE AS SECOND-CLASS MAIL MATTER.  
CENSORED BY THE POSTAL AUTHORITIES BEFORE DELIVERY TO SUBSCRIBERS.

PRICE FIVE CENTS.

CHICAGO, ILL., AUGUST 17, E. M. 305 [C. E. 1905].

WHOLE NO. 1046

### SHALL LIBERTY BE MURDERED IN THE LAND?

#### ANOTHER APPEAL TO THE PRESS AND PEOPLE OF AMERICA — INCREASING USE OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS.

In its former Appeal, the Free Speech League said that in Russia at this time the government and people are eating the fruit of the poison-tree of administrative process, a tree planted ages since and sedulously cultivated and fertilized to this hour. We said that a decade or more ago the Postal Censorship planted the seeds of this deadly tree in the soil of the United States, and that it has continued that planting with mad zeal and ever-widening sweep of the sower's arm. Those seeds have germinated; the roots of the noxious growths therefrom have penetrated deeply, have ramified, and have sent up shoots in every part of the Post-Office tillage-ground. Already appointees, legislators, and jurists declare that the vile importation never can be eradicated. Do you believe that? Are you going to let your carelessness, your apathy, your indifference, your timidity, excuse and verify the ominous prophecy?

The League told you that while Moses Harman, editor of LUCIFER, had been sentenced in a federal court on the outworn and ridiculous charge of "obscenity," at least he had had the form of trial granted by the Constitution to every accused citizen; some respect had been shown to the letter of the fundamental law, even though its spirit had been smothered by the dullness, the prejudice, and the intolerance of the administrators of that charter of rights. The judiciary had not spurned all the outward signs of decency and equity. That remained for the Post-Office Department to do, and it did it with lightness of heart and without shame. It confiscated the property of a publisher without letting him know it had robbed him—that he learned only through the inquiries of his subscribers for their paper. It destroyed this edition of the journal without offering him the most meager opportunity to show why he should not be despoiled. The subscribers, who had paid honest money for honest goods, had no means of knowing why they were denied the enjoyment of their earnings. They, like the publisher, were exploited with no chance for defense and none for redress. They, equally with Mr. Harman, were the helpless victims of the administrative process—a process invented by old-world despots to stifle thought and the latest addition to the armament of new-world tyrants in their blundering war against education.

Since that first appeal was printed, repression has proceeded apace. The Washington authorities in immediate charge have continued to do injustice, while those really responsible are silent—therefore, acquiescent. Assistant Attorney-General R. P. Goodwin, law-officer of the Post-Office Department, who interprets the statutes for his chiefs, said to Dr. Immanuel Pfeiffer, Agent of the League:

"Any and all discussion of the sex question is obscene, and so unmailable—the only occasion for any talk of such matters is in the private conversations of physicians with patients."

It was said long ago, that before stupidity even the gods are powerless. To fitly characterize this pronouncement of Mr.

Goodwin's is impossible; it would be beyond the powers of the greatest masters of English speech who have lived and died and are immortal in the world's literature. It defies serious argument; it is too ridiculous to be amenable to ridicule, and it is so small and mean that one must shrink from denouncing it. As well hunt snow birds with modern siege guns. But, unreasonable and absurd and microscopical as is the idea expressed, it is the Law of the Press and Mails. It is the rule of the Postal Department, enforced by administrative process, to the indictments of which Department there has been discovered no effective demurrer, before whose judgment seat there are no jurymen to be challenged, and no witnesses for the defense to be heard, unless those witnesses persist for days, and weeks maybe, and not always then. Here no writ of error is available, no change of venue allowed. Scarcely could we believe that such a rule had been enunciated were not the conditions such as to amply prove its existence, were not our experiences so many and bitter, the outrages under it so frequent and monstrous. Superintendent Hull of the Chicago Post-Office told Mr. Harman that no references to the intimate relations of the sexes would be permitted, and it appears that he was passing down the orders of his Washington superior, Mr. Goodwin.

Now comes the latest wrong—it may not be the latest tomorrow—the holding up of No. 1045 of LUCIFER. The articles in it said to be obscene could be read to that bugaboo of the conventional, the "young person" of either sex, without fear. There is not the faintest stain of impurity on either of them, and pretexts for the persecution of Mr. Harman and the muzzling of the press must be very hard to find when such productions as these are smudged by the Censor.

How long will you permit the study of the primary and fundamental relations of men and women to be under the ban of any authority, legal or extra-legal? How long will you remain and allow your children to remain the victims of ignorance and panic? Think! Without those relations the Censors would not be here, you would not be here, your children would not be here. Will you longer consent that the brand of villainess shall be stamped upon those relations by incompetents and reactionists? Do you admit or claim that the relations which continue the race are so obscene that all discussion of them is out of order, is dangerous, is worthy of fine and imprisonment? If they are so bad as all this, how will you improve them by silence, by concealment, by cursing? Will you better conditions by the persecution of those who are trying to point out the causes of the defects that exist? Do you actually believe that in this domain ignorance is better than knowledge? If you do, why do you not contend that it is better in every other department of our lives? If you think that it is pernicious to make known the conditions and methods of re-creation, why do you not move for the suppression of Government and other publications which deal with the breeding of domesticated animals? Are men and women of less consequence than the quadrupeds and fowls they buy and sell and eat?

Editors of America, especially of the daily press, wake up, straighten up, assert your independence of the little bands of busybodies who for more than thirty years have pursued and defamed and destroyed men and women who were earnestly endeavoring to throw light into the dark places of human society. Are you not yourselves victims of this odious censorship if you

fear to protest against injustice, as some of you tell us privately you are? When such conditions obtain, what has become of the boasted "free press?"

To those, whoever they may be, who do not indorse the views of Mr. Harman, and therefore think they are not called upon to defend his rights as a man and a citizen, we commend these trenchant words of Mr. Louis F. Post, editor of the "Public," of Chicago. The excerpt is from a private letter, taken with the consent of the writer and recipient:

"If the object of your movement is to check the postal censorship, then I can see no better way than to try to enlist in the work people who are absolutely and notoriously out of sympathy with Mr. Harman, but who have sense enough to see, and power enough to make the public generally see, the danger there is to freedom of the press in allowing a bureau of the government to create precedents that may be used by bureaucrats against what people regard as legitimate publications, by proceeding in the way the Postal Department is now doing against what public opinion regards as illegitimate. I do not know that I make myself perfectly clear. It is difficult for me to do so, because my mind is so constructed, and I think yours is, as to be entirely indifferent to the kind of opinions, or even the kind of language, that is being arbitrarily suppressed by a censor, if the thing really amounts to a censorship of opinion. My fears of a censorship are more intense than my objection to anything a censor possibly can suppress. But most minds are not constructed in this way, and that is probably the kernel of the danger that threatens us. If we could make every one realize, as Americans once realized, that 'eternal vigilance is the price of liberty,' our way would be clear. But we are living in an era when nearly everybody seems to think, 'sufficient unto the day is the virtue thereof.'"

The veriest tyrant on earth will stand by those who agree with him; the test of intelligent devotion to liberty is the defense of the freedom of those who differ from us.

Moses Harman has been put to great expense by these repeated prosecutions and confiscations. His trial in court, the loss of edition after edition of LUCIFER, and the printing and circulation of protests, and explanations sent to his subscribers, have called for continuous outlays. He had no reserve fund when the storm broke, and has been able to keep the paper going only by the assistance of the relatively few who realize that his cause is their cause, his defeat their peril, his victory their security. Some have given all they could; some can give more; a vastly larger number who have not given before should give now. Money has a voice that will be heard, because it multiplies the efficiency of all other voices. It carries the word of truth and protest and appeal to hundreds and thousands who otherwise never would hear that word. It pays for typesetting, for printing, for postage, for food and shelter for those who work to make actual the dream of free science, free press, and free mails. If you believe the Censorship is wrong, help to break its power. If you believe Moses Harman should have opportunity to speak his thought, help to sustain LUCIFER. Put your thought, your wish, your protest against the administrative process, into an Express Money Order, a check, or a draft and send immediately to our Treasurer, as below.

#### THE FREE SPEECH LEAGUE.

EDW. W. CHAMBERLAIN, President.

C. L. SWARTZ, Secretary,  
Room 3, 114 Fifth Avenue.

DR. E. B. FOOTE, JR., Treasurer,  
120 Lexington Avenue.

EDWIN C. WALKER, Chmn. Ex. Com.

New York City Headquarters.

Of our contributors once more the request is made that they will kindly bear with us awhile longer. Several very excellent contributed articles are now in type awaiting the light of print, and many more have been accepted and filed for publication. If there be any comfort in the knowledge that the editor's articles share much the same fate, our friends have that kind of consolation. For many weeks he has given way to others, especially—as in the present issue, to reprints of articles from contemporary journals, showing what some of our brother and sister editors think of the postal laws and their administration, in the United States.

#### HOW THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT CONVICTS ITSELF.

The United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Animal Industry, issues a "Special Report on Diseases of the Horse," prepared under the direction of Dr. D. E. Salmon. It is published, printed and mailed by United States officials, and is a very valuable book of over 500 pages, but no more useful than Dr. Stockham's "Tokology," unless mares are more worthy of good care than mothers, or unless fatherly Uncle Sam is more solicitous for colts than babies. In this government report on page 148 is the sub-title "Hygiene of the Pregnant Mare," and the first sentence reads thus: "The pregnant mare should not be exposed to teasing by a young and ardent stallion." Dr. James Law (the writer of that chapter) is in accord with Dr. Alice B. Stockham, author of "Tokology," and if the latter is non-mailable, the former is also, and this with many other official documents cannot be lawfully delivered by mail or express. We prefer the editorial judgment of Drs. Salmon, Law and Stockham, to the legal discrimination of R. P. Goodwin, and so we say to Uncle Sam—or "the administration"—either remove R. P. Goodwin and put a saner man in the place, or stop mailing "Diseases of the Horse," and many other "non-mailable" public reports. As it is, Uncle Sam is either a fool or a criminal.

#### CENSORSHIP AND INQUISITION.

If in Austria or Russia the censor objects to any sentence or article, he compels the publisher to take the article out of the form, and our comrades will then print in the space thus left white, "Confiscated"; or, if they feel very patriotic over the incident, they will insert a verse of the national hymn. In Russia they do the same things with domestic papers, while in foreign papers the article is blackened.

The American censor is more impudent. He takes hold of the edition at the postoffice and sends it to the dead-letter office in Washington, D. C. (d. h., Dumhelts-Centrum—center of ignorance), where these papers—still the property, which is otherwise sacred, of the publisher or his subscribers—will be destroyed. To notify the publisher is only considered by the Censor after so many complaints come in that the publisher goes to inquire the fate of his edition. Now one official hides behind another. Each claims to have an office, but no opinion of his own.

So it was with No. 1042 of LUCIFER, which Moses Harman publishes. The mail bags were sent to the Chicago postoffice on June 21, while the publisher was only notified on June 30 that his paper, a costly extra number of sixteen pages, had simply been destroyed at Washington, D. C., because it had contained indecent articles. Two articles written by women are claimed to have caused the arrest. I have read both articles—several times—carefully, and find neither a word nor a sentence in them which could have caused the confiscation. The fact that the first amendment to the Constitution guarantees liberty of press, that every attempt to modify it is a treasonable act, does not concern the inquisition in the least.

Moses Harman has appealed from the decision of the lower court—a year in the penitentiary at hard labor—he is 74 years old. Judge Landis denied the accused the right to address the jury in his own behalf before they retired to decide whether he was "guilty or not guilty." When the sentence was given, the Judge forgot to put the customary question whether the accused had anything to say in his own behalf (a question which is asked of every criminal), and Moses Harman, who is hard of hearing, was convicted without hearing it, but found it out later on through his friends present.

The labor press of the whole country ought to make the case of Moses Harman an object of discussion and help raise the funds for the appeal. Moses Harman is under \$1,500 bail, and at present yet free. Every friend of Liberty should show his sympathy by helping to defray his expenses at court and by subscribing for LUCIFER.—Neues Leben (Chicago).

Speak what you think now, in hard words, and to-morrow speak what to-morrow thinks in hard words again, though it contradict everything you said to-day. A man should never be ashamed to own he has been wrong, which is but saying that he is wiser to-day than he was yesterday.—Emerson.

Give me the liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely according to conscience, above all liberties.—John Milton.

3003 B1  
de 21 43



## THE POSTOFFICE AND FREE SPEECH.

The official who is now at the head of the postal department at Washington is getting an unenviable reputation for perverting the legitimate powers of his office—perverting them sometimes in a manner almost comic.

The government has for some time been trying, very properly, to weed out from among second-class mail matter—i. e. matter entitled to be mailed at the low rate of postage granted to newspapers—such papers as are used primarily to advertise certain goods, and in which the news and other reading matter are put in only to gild the pill. But of late the postal authorities have been straining the law to make it apply to newspapers of whose views they disapprove. Several Socialist papers have been subjected to real persecution. They proved that they were not issued for advertising purposes, in any ordinary sense of the word; but the United States Postoffice thereupon took the ground that they were issued for the purpose of advertising the editor's ideas, and so were not entitled to newspaper rates. Of course, on that principle, the privileges of the mails might be refused to all the religious periodicals, to the temperance papers, to the organs of the political parties, and to every other paper published to advocate an idea.

In the case of one of these socialist periodicals, the postal authorities declared they did not believe it had enough bona-fide subscribers to entitle it to the use of the mails as a newspaper. The editor thereupon asked each of his subscribers to send to Washington a postal card certifying that he had subscribed and paid his own money for the paper; and an avalanche of postal cards was the result. Several of these papers advocating unpopular ideas have established their right to the use of the mails only after a hard struggle; and one Socialist editor had to move his paper to Canada and send it to his subscribers in the United States from over the border. The Canadian government does not like Socialism any better than the American government does, but public opinion there would not stand having the postal laws perverted into an engine of persecution.

Neither would public opinion stand it here, if the facts were known; but the victims have mainly been the exponents of doctrines so unpopular that the general press has not taken up their cause, and the general public has heard nothing about the matter. The latest case of postoffice persecution has especial interest for women. Under the law against circulating indecent literature through the mails, a whole edition of a Chicago paper has been seized and destroyed for publishing extracts from Dr. Alice B. Stockham's "Tokology"! That is, it has been suppressed nominally because it published these extracts, but really because the postal authorities disapprove of the editor's views on the woman question.

"Tokology" is a book aiming to give prospective mothers such advice upon diet and hygiene as will lessen the pain of childbirth. It has been sold and circulated through the mails for years, without objection. Many of our readers are familiar with it. There is nothing in it from beginning to end that could properly come under the law against circulating indecent literature. But the paper that published the extracts from it was Moses Harman's LUCIFER, a paper so much disliked by the authorities that they are always glad of a pretext to suppress it; and edited by a man of ideas so unpopular that the general public has looked on with seeming indifference when the law was strained against him.

Mr. Harman's cardinal doctrine is that a woman should always have the control of her own person. He also believes in the abolition of legal marriage. With the first of these ideas we fully agree; with the second we differ *in toto*. In the columns of LUCIFER, these questions are discussed by correspondents from all points of view, from the most strict to the most lax. The editor has been repeatedly brought before the courts on the charge of sending objectionable literature through the mails, generally because he has allowed some correspondent to use an unwise and offensive latitude of expression. But the intense dislike for Mr. Harman's doctrines has caused him to be subjected to long terms of imprisonment in cases that called for nothing more than a moderate fine at most; and in the present case the attack upon him is persecution and prejudice pure and simple.

The Free Speech League has taken the matter up, and issues an appeal to the press to help ventilate it. The League reprints the paragraphs condemned by the postal authorities, and asks every reader to judge for himself whether they are obscene. Dr.

Stockham says: "It is natural and reasonable that the mother should be exempt from the sexual relation during gestation," and she goes on to elaborate and enforce this idea, but without any coarseness of expression. It is hardly possible that any sane jury, whether agreeing or disagreeing with the view expressed, would pronounce her language obscene. But Mr. Harman has had no chance to bring the case before a jury. In referring to previous prosecutions of his paper, the Free Speech League says:

Here follows a long extract from the Appeal circular of the Free Speech League. The article closes in these words:

Any one wishing to send contributions to aid Mr. Harman can communicate with Dr. E. B. Foote, Jr., treasurer of the Free Speech League, 120 Lexington Avenue, New York City, who will doubtless be glad also to send further particulars regarding the matter.

No one can disapprove more strongly than we do of many of the doctrines advocated in LUCIFER; but justice is justice, and in this case Mr. Harman has certainly been treated with odious unfairness.

In view of the defeat of the bill asked for by the Massachusetts W. S. A. to forbid the publication of indecent medical advertisements; in view of the free circulation through the mails of yellow journals containing all manner of offensive scandals, decorated with flaring headlines; in view of the great mass of unquestionably corrupt and corrupting material that is sent broadcast without interference, the suppression of the quotations from Dr. Stockham is laughable. Let our government put at the head of the postal department an official who has not only more sense of fairness than the present incumbent, but also some little sense of humor.—Alice Stone Blackwell (editorial), in "Woman's Journal," Boston, August 12, 1905.

## AN UNHEARD-OF JUDGMENT.

Moses Harman, the noble old man who for twenty-five years has published LUCIFER, has been sentenced to one year in the penitentiary. The United States court found some articles published by Harman to be obscene.

Harman himself writes superior English and expresses his thoughts so skillfully that the most fanatic inquisition could not find fault. His assistants, especially some energetic women, are less careful and prudent, and one such article became the pretext for the lawsuit.

Moses Harman defends the right of free motherhood and the right of the unborn child. His teachings ought to make men happier. Whoever knows how much mischief is caused by jealousy and ignorance in matters of sex, will admit that teachers like Moses Harman are necessary; they should be highly honored and rewarded, and not punished.

An appeal will be taken from this terrible judgment, which may turn out to be a death-warrant for the much-tried old man. Such an appeal, though, costs much money. Whoever wants to show his sympathy to Moses Harman ought to read his paper and pay the \$1 it costs per year. Write to his daughter, Lillian Harman, 500 Fulton street, Chicago, Ill.—Neues Leben (Chicago).

## SUGGESTIONS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

In sending in names of new subscribers please state (1) if money for same is paid by said subscriber, or (2) is paid by remitter with knowledge and consent, or (3) without knowledge or consent of new subscriber. In the latter case, we want to write and ask if the person wishes to receive paper, so by having the information at first a great deal of labor is saved.

Those who do not wish to see their letters or names in LUCIFER should write "Not for publication" on each letter; for, while the majority do not object to their letters or extracts therefrom being used, a few do; and it would entail too much unnecessary labor to write to each for permission to make such use of their words.

## BAS RELIEF MEDALLIONS OF MOSES HARMAN.

Bas relief medallions of the bust of Moses Harman, size 9 by 14 inches (oval), the work of La Verne F. Wheeler, a well-known Chicago artist, can be had at the following prices: Plain white, \$1; old ivory, \$1.50; plain bronze, \$2; Etruscan bronze, \$2.50. Thirty-five cents additional for boxing and shipping. The proceeds of sales, after deducting bare cost, are to be devoted to the defense of LUCIFER's editor. Send orders to La Verne F. Wheeler, 3323 Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.



# LUCIFER.

THE LIGHT-BEARER.

MOSES HARMAN, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED FORTNIGHTLY AT 600 FULTON ST., CHICAGO, ILL.

## TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

One year.....\$1.00 Three months ..... 35 cents  
Six months.....50 cents Single copies..... 5 cents

Hereafter Lucifer will not be sent to subscribers after expiration of subscription except by special request. Please compare number on your wrapper with whole number of paper, and if your subscription is about to expire notify us if you wish to continue to receive Lucifer.

## EASTERN REPRESENTATIVE:

E. C. WALKER, 24 WEST 143D STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

## LUCIFER: ITS MEANING AND PURPOSE.

LUCIFER—The planet Venus; so called from its brightness.—Webster's Dictionary.

LUCIFEROUS—Giving light; affording light or the means of discovery.—Same.

LUCIFIC—Producing light.—Same.

LUCIFORM—Having the form of light.—Same.

The name Lucifer means Light-Bringing or Light-Bearing, and the paper that has adopted this name stands for Light against Darkness—for Reason against Superstition—for Science against Tradition—for Investigation and Enlightenment against Credulity and Ignorance—for Liberty against Slavery—for Justice against Privilege.

CONGRESS SHALL MAKE NO LAW RESPECTING AN ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION, OR PROHIBITING THE FREE EXERCISE THEREOF; OR ABRIDGING THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH, OR OF THE PRESS; OR THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE PEACEABLY TO ASSEMBLE, AND TO PETITION THE GOVERNMENT FOR A REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES.—First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

## THE PEOPLE ARE NOT THE GOVERNMENT.

The ordinary citizen cannot take advantage of the cheaper market because the blessed tariff raises the prices on all such goods when they are brought home. The government, however, does not have to pay duties on its purchases abroad and may buy in the cheapest market. It is the misfortune of the people that, although they make the government, they are not the government, and must pay American taxes on American goods.—Boston Herald.

And just so, also, in the matter of literature, pictures, etc. The people make the government, pay all the government expenses, but they must not write, read nor send through the mails that which they think good for young and old to know. The privilege to do this is reserved for the government officials, and for their favorites—presumably for the class or classes supposed to be able to control the most votes on election day. M. H.

## LUCIFER NO. 1045.

Owing to disorganization of work caused by previous "lock-outs" by the Postal authorities, also by the bother of getting to press our booklet, "Right to Be Born Well," we were a week late with No. 1045 of LUCIFER.

This was August tenth. Having complied, as we very honestly believed, with the admonition in regard to objectionable matter, we presented part of the edition for mailing with no apprehension that we would again be denied our citizen right to equal participation in the benefits of the people's "carrier" system, for which we pay our proportional part.

In this reasonable expectation we were once more doomed to disappointment. After reading a copy of the issue, the superintendent of second class mail matter at Chicago informed us that in his opinion the two first articles came under the inhibition of the postal regulations in regard to "obscene" literature, and that he would be obliged to refer the matter to the Postmaster-General's office at Washington, D. C.

After waiting eight days and getting no answer from headquarters of the carrier system aforesaid—which system now assumes the functions of a judiciary department of government as well as executive, we removed the paragraphs to which Mr. Hull objected, and in their stead inserted a brief explanation of the enforced delay; then, after one more day of fruitless waiting

to hear from the Postmaster-General's staff we were allowed to send the expurgated edition to LUCIFER's readers.

This third hold-up, or lock-out, within two months last past, will make us again tardy in getting to press with next issue. However, if not again denied our equal right to the common mail, LUCIFER No. 1046 will be sent out from the Chicago postoffice on Wednesday, Aug. 23, or one week behind time, as per regular order of fortnightly appearance.

## OUR ADVANCING POSTAL CENSORSHIP.

Since long before the foundation of the Federal government, American public sentiment has cherished freedom of the press above every other condition of popular liberty except trial by jury. With the press untrammelled our fathers believed that no menace to liberty could really gain a foothold, if an innovation, or long endure, if already established; whereas, if the press were subject to censorship, they felt that autocracy would flourish as in their day it did throughout Europe and as in ours it still does in Russia.

They did not mean that the press should have license to attack personal reputations or offend public morals with impunity. They conceded that publishers should be held to account for libelous and indecent publications. But they insisted that guilt should be determined by juries, after the act, and upon a full hearing of both sides; and not by bureau officials in advance of the act and ex parte.

Much has been said against this view on the ground that it would permit the accomplishment of wrongs which once done cannot be undone; and it must be confessed that the objection is not without plausibility when particular grievances are considered irrespective of general effects. But our fathers realized that the greater danger lies in empowering officials to impose upon publishers a decree of silence. A person outraged by libel would be vindicated by the verdict that condemned his libeler; common standards of public morals would be strengthened by the verdict of juries if the standards were true, and weakened by assault only in case they were false. But under a censorship, private outrages upon public rights might go unrevealed and unscathed; true standards of public morals might be perverted and false ones perpetuated; and with a pretence of protecting personal reputation and public morals, bureaucrats might insidiously undermine popular liberty.

Our fathers therefore made it a part of their political religion that every one should be free to print and publish whatever he would, subject to being held accountable therefor by a jury of his fellow citizens. So wedded were they to this theory of a free press accountable only to a jury of the people, that the result of a lawsuit in the old Colony of New York was acclaimed throughout the Colonies and helped kindle the fires of the Revolution, because the jury had found that an alleged libel against the Colonial authorities was justified and the publisher not guilty, notwithstanding that the Colonial judge before whom the case was tried had ordered the jury to convict.

So vital did this sentiment remain after the Revolution, that the Federal party went down in political wreck and ruin because it became responsible for the "sedition act," which evaded the principle of a free but accountable press by making libels against the President and other Federal officials triable before judges of the President's own appointment and juries selected by his own appointees.

So vital did that sentiment continue down the troublous century just ended, that even in the heat of the anti-slavery agitation a pro-slavery Senate revolted at a suggestion that anti-slavery newspapers be made unmailable.

We believe that this wholesome sentiment of liberty survives in the American mind. Though a great influx of foreigners in recent years—foreigners seeking not greater liberty as in earlier times, but only better wages—may have had the effect of making American landmarks of liberty fade in the public opinion of today, yet the autocratic conditions of which we get reports from Russia are abhorrent enough to stir even the duller mind to some sense of the dangers which go with a bureaucratic censorship of the press. It is an innovation which we believe American public opinion would not consciously tolerate. Were any direct attempt made to subject to the control of a government bureau the right to print and publish freely, subject only to accountability to juries, it would surely overwhelm the political party responsible for it, as the Federal party of a hundred years



ago was overwhelmed, with the condemnation of an indignant people.

But what could not be done directly because the people would resent it, might be done indirectly and surreptitiously because the people would not realize that it was being done.

And it is a fact, that by indirect and surreptitious methods a censorship is gradually being established over printing and publishing in the United States. It has advanced so far that a Federal bureau at Washington already possesses power of press censorship sufficient to enable it to suppress any periodical whatever, in the discretion of the officials who control the bureau.

We do not intend to say that every possible attempt at such suppression would succeed. What we do intend to say is that the censorial power which already exists in this Federal bureau is unlimited in its possibilities and threatening in its character. To a consideration of this fact we beg most earnestly to call serious public attention.

★ ★ ★

Let us consider first how a situation so serious might come about.

If an autocratic coterie, acute, skillful and patient, were deliberately set upon the purpose of creating a press censorship like that of Russia, in a republic like ours, where the traditions and the laws guaranteed freedom of the press subject to accountability only to juries, and where public opinion clung tenaciously to the spirit of those traditions, how would that coterie begin?

Not by trying to repeal the laws nor by violently overriding them. Either would be a hopeless undertaking in those circumstances. Such a coterie would begin by trying to invest with censorial power that bureau of the government, if there were such a bureau, which managed the distribution among the people of written and printed matter.

In doing this the coterie would at first carefully limit the censorship to such written and printed matter as was most intensely offensive to public morals; for that would be along the line of least resistance. A vast majority of the people, their thought centered upon offenses against morality and drawn away from offenses against liberty, would cordially approve the innovation.

Later a similar censorship would be extended by this coterie of liberty destroyers, to written and printed matter somewhat less offensive to public morals; and thus on and on by easy stages to such as was less and less offensive.

And the same acute discretion would be observed in the execution of these powers of censorship. The bureau so invested with censorial authority would at first execute its powers only against violators of the most sacred tenets of public morality. As its censorial powers were thereby commended to public approval, they would be applied to less repulsive offenders or those who occupied debatable ground, some of whom might bring the subject into the courts.

But the courts, keen to see that a decision in favor of minor or dubious offenders would make a precedent favorable to the repulsive class, would prefer making a precedent against liberty to making one against public morals. A few such precedents against liberty, in the guise of precedents for morality, and the hardest work of the censor-seeking coterie would be nearly done.

The bureau could then begin, on pretense of suppressing immorality, to discriminate against the publication of legitimate opinions. Over this there would be a struggle in the courts. But when the courts had decided that the bureau was engaged in executive work, and that its interference therein with private rights, even to the extent of seizing and confiscating private property upon evidence satisfactory to the bureaucrat, must not be prevented, the censor-seeking work of the coterie would be complete.

After that, there would be nothing to limit the scope of the censorship.

An object of sufficient importance to the coterie, and a confederate of sufficient nerve at the head of the bureau, would make a censorship which the crude censors of Russia might envy.

By deciding as to any periodical whatever, and however falsely, upon evidence satisfactory to himself, that its contents were offensive to public morals, the head of this bureau could effectually suppress that publication. And the mere fact that he could do this, would have a powerful effect in influencing all periodicals to support or oppose public policies as the persons or parties controlling the censorizing bureau might direct.

It is by insidious steps, such as are here suggested as pos-

sible, that the public opinion of free people has always been suppressed, and that their other liberties have been wrested from them in the consequent silence.

★ ★ ★

Now, in this country there is just such a bureau as we have imagined above. It is known as the Post Office Department. That department controls the delivery and receipt of almost all the written and printed matter of the country. Nearly all private correspondence, nearly all books, nearly all periodicals, are circulated by its machinery. It has gone so extensively into the business of distributing letters and periodicals for the people that all business is dependent upon it, and any periodical against which it might discriminate could not long continue publication.

To invest this department with power to grant or refuse its distributing service to periodicals, with reference to its own judgment of the legitimacy of their printed contents, would be to place at its mercy every periodical which the department might wish to destroy.

But not only have we such a bureau in this country, in the Post Office Department, but that department has been gradually invested, in very much the manner indicated above, with the censorial powers outlined above as possible. And it has exercised those powers with similarly aggressive discretion. We do not mean that there has been a conscious and definite purpose of creating a dangerous censorship, as in the imagined case; but that there has been similar progress in a direction in which similar results are the inevitable ultimate.

The investiture of the Post Office Department with arbitrary censorship over the press, began (as we have indicated in our suppositions that such a censorship probably would begin), with legislation against such postal matter as was most intensely offensive to public morals. Obscene letters and papers were declared to be unmailable and the act of mailing them a crime. To this innovation objection was difficult. No appeal to the principle of freedom of the press could be made which would not seem like an attempt at shielding vile offenses, with appeals to political traditions and abstractions—like opposing “mere generalizations” or theories of government to actual immoralities. Under cover of the silence which decency thus imposed, the postal censorship thus gained a foothold.

Then further steps were taken. The ban of unmailability was extended to mail matter in furtherance of frauds. Decency did not impose silence here, but what could be said against laws for the suppression of fraud? Nothing that would not make the objector seem to be an apologist for actual crime on pretense of devotion to a mere “theory of liberty.”

Nor was much difficulty encountered in extending the postal censorship against obscene and fraudulent mail matter to mail matter in connection with lotteries. Public opinion had become ripe for excluding that business from its old place in the category of the legitimate, and objections to this extension of the censorship were rebuked as sympathetic with lotteries, instead of being accorded a fair hearing in the interest of freedom of the press.

While censorial statutes were accumulating, criminal prosecution which never got before the highest court were building up a mass of precedents, and rules and rulings of the Postal Department were establishing censorial lines of administrative procedure which have crystallized with time. And so it has come about that the postal department has acquired and is actually exercising the ominous censorial power to which we invite attention.

Upon decrees sent out from a bureau at Washington, all their correspondence is withheld from individuals, on the charge, established before no judicial tribunal, that at some time in the past they have solicited correspondence through the mails for purposes of fraud; and legitimate periodicals are suppressed, on pretense that they contain obscene language or sentiments. In none of these cases is the alleged offender given a jury trial, in none does his case come before a judicial tribunal, in all his nearest approach to a trial is before attaches of the censoring bureau which makes the charge, and in some the specific accusations are withheld from him.

★ ★ ★

With the details of one of these cases of newspaper suppression we have been at the pains to make ourselves acquainted. It is the case of LUCIFER (p. 242), a Chicago publication, issues of which have but recently been suppressed by the postal depart-



ment. Our information relates to a previous suppression for the same alleged cause, and not to a recent one. Whether the latter would prove to be similar to the former we do not know, nor do we regard it as important to the point under consideration, which is not the propriety or impropriety of suppression in a particular case, but the danger of suppression in this manner in any case. As the instance to which our information relates illustrates the tendency toward a censorship of the press, it is sufficient for the purpose in hand.

Our inquiry into the matter began with the following letter of January 27, 1904, to the postmaster at Chicago:

"I am informed that the Chicago office stopped the transportation as second-class matter of a Chicago weekly called LUCIFER, the issue of December 17; that the reason given was violation of section 497 of Postal Laws and Regulations; that nothing in apparent violation of that section appeared in the issue in question; and that your office refuses definite information. Will you kindly inform me, for public use, what the specific offense of the issue in question was?"

In his reply of January 29, the Chicago postmaster courteously stated that the Chicago office had not originated the act of suppression, but had merely obeyed orders from Washington. He wrote:

"The issue of LUCIFER THE LIGHT BEARER dated Dec. 17, '03, was refused admittance to the mails by direction of the Department at Washington, which ruled that matter in that edition was in violation of section 497 of the post office laws and regulations. Under date of Dec. 19, '03, the publisher was advised to this effect."

It will be observed that the Chicago postmaster did not deny that specific information of his offense had been withheld from the accused publisher, and that he did not give the information asked for in the letter to which his was in reply, namely—the specific offense. In this reticence he was doubtless, as events subsequently indicated, obeying orders from Washington. It was also to be observed that the publisher was not notified of the suppression until two days after his date of publication.

Having learned from the Chicago postmaster that he had acted under orders from Washington, and been tactfully though courteously refused information as to the specific offense of LUCIFER, we extended our inquiry to the Postmaster General in a letter of February 13, 1904. In replying by letter of March 3, 1904, the First Assistant Postmaster General wrote:

"I have received your letter of February 13, addressed to the Postmaster General, in reference to the exclusion from the mails of a publication entitled LUCIFER THE LIGHT BEARER. The issue of December 19 contained matter which is unmailable under section 497, Postal Laws and Regulations, and therefore the Postmaster at Chicago was instructed to treat copies of that issue in his office in the same manner as other unmailable matter is treated."

Still we had failed to get information of the specific charge against LUCIFER, sufficient to enable us by examining the paper to form a judgment as to the official good faith of its suppression; and from an examination of the whole paper we had been unable to discover anything apparently justifying the charge of violating the postal section referred to. Accordingly we asked of the Postmaster General, by letter of March 14, 1904, that he do us the favor of indicating—

"the particular article or articles, by their titles or otherwise, which are regarded by the Department as unmailable under section 497? If you could indicate the particular paragraphs of the articles that are regarded as unmailable I should be obliged?"

In answer to that inquiry the Acting First Assistant Postmaster General, in a letter of March 29 wrote:

"You ask that the particular article to which exception was taken by the Post Office Department be pointed out to you. If you will kindly call upon our Inspector in charge at Chicago, who has the copy of the paper to which you refer, that officer will be able to comply with your request."

An effort to act upon this suggestion, and the result, are described in a letter of June 13, 1904, to the Postmaster General, in which, after a recital of previous correspondence, we wrote:

"There seems to be some misunderstanding, possibly on my own part, though I do not see how I am at fault. In reference to your Acting First Assistant's letter, I have called on the Inspector in charge at Chicago and shown him your Acting First Assistant's letter. After reading it he told me that he could not supply me with the information because his assistant, Mr. McAfee, in

whose charge the matter had been, was then out of the city, but that upon the return of Mr. McAfee he, the Chief Inspector, would notify me and supply me with the information. Accordingly a few days later a messenger called at my office, and, I being out, left word for me to call up Mr. McAfee by telephone. When I did so, Mr. McAfee was out of his office. When I did so again, the next day, he had gone out of the city. But on the latter occasion the chief clerk in the Inspector's office, learning my identity and knowing my object, informed me that the Chicago office cannot furnish me with the requested information. He explained that the suppression of LUCIFER under section 497 had not taken place under the initiative of the Chicago office, but had been ordered by the First Assistant Postmaster General, and that the Chicago office does not know what the objectionable matter was. In answer to my further inquiry he assured me, but with entire courtesy, that I might regard this reply as official and treat it accordingly. I am therefore under the necessity of again troubling your office in this matter. Will you kindly arrange in some proper and convenient way to supply me, for legitimate newspaper use, with the information I am seeking, namely, what are the particular articles, designating them if possible by their titles, on account of which the Post Office Department suppressed the issue of December 17, 1903, of LUCIFER THE LIGHT BEARER, of Chicago, as unmailable under section 497 of the Postal Laws and Regulations, and what are the particular paragraphs of such articles in which the objectionable matter is to be found."

No attention having been paid to this inquiry, after the lapse of more than a month, we addressed the Postmaster General, by letter of July 23, 1904, offering to forward a copy of our letter of the 13th of June if the original had failed to reach the Department. Still without reply, on the 19th of August, 1904, we wrote again to the Postmaster General, referring to our two previous letters and asking:

"Will you kindly give me the information requested in those letters, or advise me of the time when you can probably do so, if delay is necessary."

This request brought a reply from the Acting First Assistant Postmaster General, dated August 25, 1904, as follows:

"I have received your letter of the 19th instant calling attention to the fact that yours of June 13 had not been answered. Replying specifically to your inquiry, I have to state that the article on page\* . . . and the article on page\* . . . are, in the opinion of this Department, offensive under the Act of Congress approved September 26, 1888."

The reply gives no indication of the paragraph or paragraphs of the articles mentioned as containing the matter which in the opinion of the postal censor is unmailable, although this information was distinctly requested. We are obliged, therefore, if we would examine into the good faith of the censor, to consider the articles as a whole, word by word, thought by thought, from first word to last. This necessity is in itself significant of the arbitrary and secretive methods of the Department in passing upon questions involving freedom of publication.

Upon examination of the articles we failed to find anything, either in the thought alone or the phrase alone, which could be condemned by the ordinary standards of decency. While it is true that the colloquial phrasing is so ill-adapted to the sociological subject discussed as to offend good taste, taste is not yet subject to postal censorship. And while neither the subject nor the phrasing would be appropriate at a young people's party, this is no test of postal propriety.

The subject matter, considered by itself, is a legitimate one

\*We omit the page numbers and the titles of the two articles which the Acting First Assistant Postmaster General gave in his letter. Our reason for the omission is that such a publication here might subject this issue of The Public to suppression by order of the postal censor bureau. The same Act of Congress by authority of which LUCIFER was censored for publishing those articles, provides also that "notice of any kind giving information, directly or indirectly, where or how, or of whom or by what means an 'obscene . . . publication of an indecent character' 'may be obtained,' is itself 'non-mailable matter.' Since the censors have already decided that the articles in question are obscene and indecent, they might decide that the naming of them by title and page in connection with the name of the publication in which they appeared, is a notice making the paper publishing it also guilty under the statute and therefore subject to suppression. Were they to so decide, they could suppress this issue of The Public, and we should be without protection or redress or any power to get a judicial trial. Inasmuch, therefore, as that part of the Acting First Assistant Postmaster General's letter which we have excised in quoting it above, is not absolutely necessary for the information of our readers, we prefer to avoid an unnecessary risk of censorship, by omitting it.



for public discussion among adults; and, expressed in philosophical phrasing, it could not possibly be objected to as salacious.

The phrasing, considered by itself, is not out of the common in the current literature of fiction. If any well-known novelist had put these two articles, thought by thought and word by word, into the mouths of characters in a problem novel, it is almost inconceivable that any publishing house, other than the American Tract Society, would have suppressed them; and if the postal censors had condemned them as obscene by excluding the novels from the mails, a cry of derision would have echoed from one end of the country to the other.

\* \* \*

The inference seems to us unavoidable, that the issue of LUCIFER of December 17, 1903, was excluded from the mails, not because of any violation of the postal statute, but because it advocated doctrines of social life at variance with those to which the postal censors are professedly devoted. In other words, it was suppressed, not for decency's sake, but for opinion's sake.

With the opinions intended to be censored by the suppression of LUCIFER, we are entirely out of sympathy. Were they up for discussion under circumstances demanding our participation, we should emphatically condemn them—not because they are unconventional, but because we believe them to be unsound. But the question here is not whether they are unsound. It is whether their discussion shall be forbidden.

On that issue we yield to no one in demanding the fullest freedom of discussion for every debatable question. Nothing but error can suffer from honest debate. And while we recognize the propriety as to taste, and the decency as to morals, of limiting discussions of some subjects, not only conventionally, but by law if necessary, to appropriate occasions, we do not regard the use of the mails for the distribution of any discussion whatever, for adult readers, and in good faith, as a violation of the proprieties of discussion. We do regard the denial of their use for such purposes as a menace to one of the most important safeguards of liberty, and an obstruction to the most important promoter of progress.

Yet we hesitate to denounce the postal censor for suppressing a paper for its opinions. To denounce him for that might be quite unjust. He only suppressed disagreeable opinions, and that is what most men would do who have the power. It is what the censors of the Czar do, when they forbid publication of the proceedings of a national congress. It is what our own censors in the Philippines did, when they forbade the publication of the Declaration of Independence. It is what we ourselves might be tempted to do if we were at the head of the postal censor bureau—since the opinions as to marriage which LUCIFER advocates are repugnant to our views. If we had the power as censor to read "offensive to the statute" into LUCIFER's opinions, or into those of any other periodical whose opinions on social philosophy, religion or politics we reject, we might give way to the temptation to which the postal censor appears to have succumbed in LUCIFER's case.

But all this is one of the very reasons why powers of censorship, even for the best of purposes, and though reposed in persons of liberal disposition, are dangerous powers.

Power fattens upon what it feeds on. Little by little, from suppressing evil reading to suppressing that which is doubtful, it advances to the suppression of unpopular opinions, and then to those that are popular; and it makes its advances so insidiously that all freedom of opinion is throttled by censors before the people realize it has been assailed.

That the point of suppressing unpopular opinions in one branch of social philosophy has already been reached, is evident from the circumstances of the LUCIFER case which we describe above.

Here is a publication depending for existence, as all others do, upon regularity of mail circulation. Without notice, accusation, specification, trial or hearing of any sort, a regular issue, the full edition, is confiscated by a local postmaster upon orders from the censor at Washington. After this suppression, the publisher is notified of it, but information as to the specific fact upon which the arbitrary action was based is withheld. He is told he has violated a particular postal law, but he is not told how he has done it. Nor does he get a hearing even on the vague general charge of which he is advised. The action is as arbitrary as such actions are in Russia. In Russia, indeed, the censor is more considerate. He lamp-blacks objectionable articles and cir-

culates the rest of the paper; but our censor suppresses the whole edition, the "good" along with the "bad." And after the edition has been suppressed, another paper, interested in sounding an alarm if freedom of the press has been bureaucratically assailed, is trifled with by the censors for months, in its efforts to discover the specific offense for which the suppressed paper was suppressed, only to learn finally that it was for publishing two articles, only the titles of which are given, and in which, however offensive they may be to good taste, even a prude could hardly find material for specifications on a charge of immorality.

A censorship which can maintain this attitude toward freedom of the press respecting one subject of discussion, will have little difficulty in speedily advancing its meddlesome jurisdiction to other subjects.

The real issue here, let us repeat—and it will bear repetition again and again—is not the legal offensiveness of the particular articles noted above. That issue is important only for its bearing upon the point of the good faith of the censor. The real issue is the wisdom of allowing any official to deny mailing facilities to anything whatever which is otherwise mailable, merely upon his own judgment, as a censor, of the morality of the intelligence it conveys or the opinions it expresses.

Granted that some publications ought to be excluded, the power of discrimination cannot safely be entrusted to an administrative official. A bureau of administration with authority to exclude matter from the mails with reference to the intelligence or the opinions it conveys, will inevitably grow into a bureau of dangerous censorship.

For offenses against the purity of the mails the only safe remedy is the one that is applied to purity in every other connection—to the legitimate method which has been sanctioned and approved by long usage in English-speaking countries; and this is to punish offenders after they, having had an opportunity to be heard upon specific charges, have been convicted by a jury of their fellow citizens.

If opinions in this country are to stand or fall upon reason and free discussion, the present postal censorship must be abolished. So long as publication through the mails can be denied arbitrarily by an administrative bureau of the government, the discussion of conflicting opinions is hampered.

Even the sentiment of fair play, entirely apart from all considerations of a free press, demands the abolition of this censorship. So long as an administrative officer can withdraw mailing rights from a publication for any offense whatever, without an opportunity for the publisher to be heard in his own defense before an impartial tribunal, fair play is impossible. Though we deny mailing rights to indecent publications, fair play demands that the person accused of the offense, and whose personal and property rights are involved in the accusation, shall have the opportunity he is guaranteed in all other cases to convince his fellow citizens that his publication is not indecent. It is his right to be judicially heard in his own defense.

Instances like that of the suppression of LUCIFER by postal censorship point so directly and unmistakably to great injustice and public danger that any fair-minded man may see it and every patriotic man ought to resent it. No matter what one's opinion of any paper and its teachings may be, there should be but one opinion of a postal organization which permits in any case what was done in that case, and this should be an opinion of unqualified condemnation.

The confiscation by postal clerks, of any publication, for any cause, without specific charges, without opportunity to the publisher to be heard, without the verdict of a jury, without appeal, without any of the ordinary safeguards of personal rights and private property, and consequently without any assurance of guilt, is an ominous fact. No matter how objectionable or even dangerous a paper's teachings may seem to the censor, no matter how offensive its language in their estimation, so palpable an invasion of the commonest rights of citizenship is a direct menace to the independent press of the country. Any law that authorizes it should be swept from the statute books.

The only difference between such a power and that of Russian censorship is a difference neither in kind nor degree. It is a difference only in scope of execution. And scope of execution widens with use.

The issue before us turns not upon the propriety of excluding indecent publications from the mails, but upon the wisdom and justice of allowing administrative officers to hamper freedom of the press and confiscate property rights, upon their own opinion of what constitutes indecency, and without an opportunity for the alleged offender to be heard in his defense. Under the postal censorship, publications are denied mailing rights, not because they are offensive to decency, but because the censor, from whom there is no appeal, chooses to think them so. Here is the seed of a mighty tree of absolutism.—Louis F. Post, in "The Public," Chicago (editorial), August 12, 1905.



## VARIOUS VOICES.

Full name and address of writers in this department can generally be obtained on application to the editor.

We are always glad to receive calls from friends visiting the city. Take the Lake street elevated, stop at Ashland avenue, walk one block east, then one block north. Or take Fulton street electric car west and stop at St. John's place, alighting in front of our house. The Lake street electric and Paulina street cars also pass within a block of our residence.

T. M. Watson, Whitewater, Wis.—I enclose my second 25-cent piece, as promised, to help sustain you in your tribulations. I most sincerely hope all your subscribers and friends will remember to make little remittances from time to time, to encourage you in your struggles.

Gertie Vose, Home, via Lakebay, Wash.—Your latest trouble is certainly provoking much thought and heated discussions, which I believe will end in good work. Last Sunday, at our park meeting, Lois Walsbrooker read a prose-poem of her own composition, entitled "Freedom's Martyrs," which went through the audience like a thunderbolt. Tears streamed from many eyes, applause nearly shook the ground, and the deepest emotions were stirred in every breast. In such times one seems almost incapable of expressing one's indignation at the powers that ride rough-shod over the really pure and innocent ones, allowing the widest scope to degenerates—those with arrested mentalities. Wish you could spend a year at Home. We certainly have a good thing here—no angels or heaven, but just good warm comrades. Inclosed is \$1 for subscription to LUCIFER.

F. A. M. Cook, M. D., Elm Place, R. R. 3, Columbus, Kan.—I am going to christen my new mail box by renewing my subscription to LUCIFER. It is surprising to me that men and women who claim to be intelligent do not think the human race need to be instructed in the science most essential to life. Stock and plants and fruit are improved; books, essays, and lectures are the proper thing on that subject; but boys and girls are not considered worthy of any improvement. They must not be taught that they have in their make-up organs which make them grand and noble by a proper use, or destroy them physically and mentally by abuse of the same. Inclosed find \$1.50; the dollar for LUCIFER and the 50 cents for you, with the wish it was so many dollars.

Arthur Wastall, 3 Amalinda Road, East London, Cape Colony.—I thank you for letting me know what is happening. I received last week the Free Speech League's circular apprising me that trial would take place 1st June. I mailed them 30 shillings last week on behalf of two friends and myself. The one is a Frenchman here in East London, and the other an Australian lady. Both know you through me and admire your pluck and outspokenness. Lady Florence Dixie has always been a true friend of progress. She is well known in England to dietetic and anti-vivisection reformers, and used to help the Natural Food propaganda when I was conducting it. Such broad-mindedness is refreshing wherever found, but especially in aristocratic circles, where one scarcely looks for it.

J. W. Gott, Bradford, England—Your trial took place under a judge and jury who have done you a great injustice, which I hope will be righted in the higher court. I am glad to see you bear it with dignity and with the scorn such treatment deserves.

J. Allen Evans, Box 923, Cripple Creek, Colo.—I herewith enclose \$1 to pay for "Thoughts of a Fool," already received and read. I've read many books on the sex question, but never read anything equal to "Thoughts of a Fool." The author is only a fool in the eyes of a time-serving, conventional society. She is not only a brilliant, but a fine, good woman; any radical sending for her book who does not say that it is worth its weight in gold can enclose the book to me and I'll send them the dollar for it. Don't fail to read the "Thoughts of a Fool"—it's the treat of a lifetime. It would be a grand old world to live in if all women were like the authoress.

The Anthony Comstock legislation, as interpreted by the courts and the postal department, is entitled to no more respect than the acts of Parliament which our Revolutionary forefathers defied, or the pro-slavery statutes and decisions which the friends of liberty violated and apropos of which Wendell Phillips declared, "The chief use of good laws is to teach men to trample bad laws under their feet." We are as bound to break bad laws as we are to keep good laws. Whenever human law and divine law become irreconcilable, the human law, not the divine law, should be violated. "We ought to obey God rather than men." The leaders and saviors of men have often been law-breakers. Moses, Daniel, Peter, Huss, Luther, Tell, Kossuth, Bozzaris, George Washington and John Brown were law-breakers. Thank God for the brave men and women who break bad laws for conscience sake!—Doctor Jeremiah Justice, Mount Sterling, Illinois.

George Brown, Philadelphia, Pa.—I cannot begin to tell you how entirely satisfied I am with you and what you do. The simplicity and dignity with which you meet and pass through such trying ordeals charms me out of myself. You at least have no "murdered ideals" to mourn over. You are, I think, the only

1046

If these figures correspond with the number printed on the wrapper of your Lucifer, your subscription expires with this number.

If a copy of Lucifer fails to reach you, please order by number or date.

man who has impressed me as being in yourself greater than the ideals for which we both stand. I do hope there will be some way of keeping you out of prison, for you are an old man and the physical strain might be too much for you; otherwise I should not so much fear, for I know that you will bear it to the confusion of your enemies. Do you know, I envy you the many honors that are being heaped upon you by those who seek to perpetuate ancient and hoary injustices? But I freely add mine to the many good wishes and kind thoughts that will go with you into the prison cell, should you have to go. You have the certainty that that cell should be the brightest and cheeriest place on earth could we but make it so. I send you a dollar on subscription, and will send more soon. Of course I want you to send LUCIFER, even though I am a little slow in remitting; I will pay some time.

Phillip G. Peabody, 15 Court Square, Boston, Mass.—Like other lovers of justice, I honor you, and despise the politicians who are so insolently interfering with your and my rights, more than I can say. This outrage on you has done more to destroy my patriotism than anything that ever came into my life. I regret that I have ceased to be a good and loyal United States citizen. N. B.—The use of the word "American," to indicate a citizen of our country, is a sample of the arrogant impudence of the group of politicians at present "running" the country.—It gave me much pleasure to send to Dr. Foote, Jr., \$25 for your defense. Not seeing it credited in "Lucifer's Helpers," on page 346, I write, as requested.—You have now, as always, my best wishes. To say that you are as far above those who are persecuting you, as Jesus Christ was above the men who crucified him, would be to pay you a very small and imperfect compliment.

## BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

## THOUGHTS OF A FOOL,

A book which deals with all the questions of the day: Sex, Popular Morality, "Success," "The Man to Be," "Life's Message," "Symbols and Tags," "The Universal Secret," etc., etc., in a manner boldly original.

## ONE HUNDRED OF OUR SUBSCRIBERS

can have a chance to read a copy, for the publishers have offered 100 copies to OUR SUBSCRIBERS at the SPECIAL RATE OF \$1.00.

## (IT'S A \$1.50 BOOK.)

It's been widely read, much reviewed and has created a storm of criticism and praise.

Don't send for it, if you don't want strong stuff, original thought, bold views that may shock your prejudices.

Don't send for it if you have prejudices!

AND THERE ARE ONLY 100 COPIES ANYWAY AT THIS PRICE, \$1.00.

We'll return your money if the 100 are sold when it reaches us.

## THE OCCIDENTAL MYSTIC.

A 32-page Monthly Magazine, devoted to the consideration of Spiritualism and the Occult Sciences, clean, bright and filled from cover to cover with original matter from able contributors, issued on the 20th of each month; \$1 a year; single copy, 10 cts. ARTHUR S. HOWE, Editor and Publisher; 6 Cottage Row, San Francisco, Calif.

A STUFFED CLUB. A monthly periodical teaching Health of Body and Mind by knocking the stuffing out of religious and medical superstition. For those who can think and are not afraid to think. It is the Club's attention to be constructive as well as destructive. \$1 a year, 10c a month. Address A STUFFED CLUB, Denver, Colo.

## BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL CARDS.

## OTTO WETTSTEIN,

## THE LIBERAL MAIL-ORDER JEWELER.

Now permanent at No. 110 N. Kensington av., La Grange, Cook Co., Ill. Can save you 10 to 20 per cent on Watches, Diamonds or anything in the Jeweler's Line. Write me and receive prices and my great little tract, "Theism in the Crucible," free.

## J. H. GREER, M. D.

53 DEARBORN ST., CHICAGO.

Office Hours—9 a. m. to 6 p. m.; Wednesdays and Saturdays, 9 a. m. to 8 p. m.; Sundays, 9 a. m. to 12 m. Telephone Randolph 42.

## DR. OGILVIE A. RICE,

DENTIST.

1556 MILWAUKEE AVE., COR. WESTERN, CHICAGO.  
Telephone West 141.

## PHILIP G. PEABODY,

ATTORNEY AND COUNSELLOR AT LAW.  
15 COURT SQUARE, ROOM 61  
BOSTON, MASS.